



County of San Diego
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

MARK WARDLAW
Director

DARREN GRETLER
Assistant Director

5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 110, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

**Statement of Reasons for Exemption from
Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist
Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15183**

Date: August 15, 2013
Project Title: Renteria Minor Subdivision
Kiva #: PDS2007-3200-21107 (TPM), PDS2007-3910-07-19-009 (ER)
Plan Area: Jamul-Dulzura
GP Designation: Semi-Rural (SR-10)
Density: N/A
Zoning: A-72 (General Agricultural)
Min. Lot Size: 8 acres
Special Area Reg.: N/A
Lot Size: 59.2 acres
Applicant: Alfonso and Elena Renteria, (619) 397-0953
Staff Contact: Marisa Smith - (858) 694-2621
marisa.smith@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The project is a minor subdivision to divide a 59-acre property into four residential lots. The proposed Parcels 2, 3, and 4 would be eight acres in size, while Parcel 1 would be approximately 34 acres. The project site is located on Skyline Truck Trail, east of Lyons Valley Road in the Jamul-Dulzura Subregional Plan Area. Access to Parcel 1 would be provided by an existing 24-foot wide private road easement connecting to Skyline Truck Trail. Access to Parcel 2 would be provided by a 20-foot wide panhandle private road easement. Parcels 3 and 4 would share a 20-foot wide panhandle private road easement. Water would be provided by private wells and sewer would be provided by individual septic systems. The site is currently vacant, and abuts a mobile home park, which is located just north of the proposed subdivision. While no earthwork would be proposed at the mapping stage, future grading would consist of 8,350 cubic yards of cut and fill for pads and driveway, and approximately 755 cubic yards for road grading.

The project site is subject to the Semi-Rural General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation Semi-Rural. Zoning for the site is A72, General Agricultural. The project is consistent with density and lot size requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Overview

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant

effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that are: (1) peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that would result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

Summary of Findings

The Renteria Minor Subdivision (PDS2007-3200-21107) is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00 - Mitigation Measures 2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf) for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the

development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project qualifies for an exemption because the following findings can be made:

1. The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.

The project would subdivide a 59.2-acre property into four residential lots, which is consistent with the Semi-Residential development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

2. There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.

The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area, and there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The project site is located in an area developed with similarly sized, estate residential lots with associated accessory uses. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the project would not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.

3. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.

The proposed project is consistent with the density and use characteristics of the development considered by the GPU EIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for build-out of the General Plan. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.

4. There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

5. The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, the project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR. These GPU EIR mitigation measures will be undertaken through project design, compliance with regulations and ordinances, or through the project's conditions of approval.


Signature

August 15, 2013

Date

Marisa Smith

Printed Name

Project Manager

Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, environmental effects are evaluated to determine if the project would result in a potentially significant impact triggering additional review under Guidelines section 15183.

- Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.
- Items checked “Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates that the project would result in a project specific significant impact in a manner which is considered unusual or uncommon and was not identified in the GPU EIR.
- Items checked “Substantial New Information” indicates that there is new information which leads to a determination that a project impact is more severe than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

A project does not qualify for a §15183 exemption if it is determined that it would result in: 1) a peculiar impact that was identified as a significant impact under the GPU EIR; 2) a more severe impact due to new information; or 3) a potentially significant off-site impact or cumulative impact not discussed in the GPU EIR.

A summary of staff’s analysis of each potential environmental effect is provided below the checklist for each subject area. A list of references, significance guidelines, and technical studies used to support the analysis is attached in Appendix A. Appendix B contains a list of GPU EIR mitigation measures.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. AESTHETICS – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 1(a) The project would be visible from public roads and trails; however, the site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The property is located along Skyline Truck Trail, and is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality for the following reasons: the project site is surrounded by residential development on similarly sized lots, with a recreational vehicle (RV) park to the north. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) The project would be consistent with existing community character. The project is located in an area characterized by residential, agricultural, and recreational uses. The addition of four new residential lots would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings.
- 1(d) Residential lighting would be required to conform with the County's Light Pollution Code to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties and minimize impacts to dark skies.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to aesthetics; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources | | | |
| – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 2(a) The project and surrounding properties do not support any Farmland of Local Importance, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.
- 2(b) The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land.
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the property.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands.
- 2(e) The project site is not located near any important farmlands or active agricultural production areas.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to agricultural resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

- | | Significant
Project
Impact | Peculiar Impact
not identified by
GPU EIR | Substantial
New
Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3. Air Quality – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐ ☐ ☐

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

☐ ☐ ☐

Discussion

3(a) The project proposes development that was anticipated and considered by SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below screening levels, and will not violate any ambient air quality standards.

3(b) Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 48 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants.

3(c) The project would contribute PM10, NOx, and VOCs emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above)).

3(d) The project will introduce additional residential homes which are considered new sensitive receptors; however, the project site is not located within a quarter-mile of any identified point source of significant emissions. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots.

3(e) The project could produce objectionable odors during construction and operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m3).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to air quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 4. Biological Resources – Would the Project: | | | |
| Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

4(a) Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Report prepared by Vince N. Scheidt, dated January 2013. The site contains 47.2 acres of southern mixed chaparral, 0.8 acre of southern coast live oak riparian forest, 0.6 acre of Freshwater seep, and 9.7 acres of non-native grassland. Sensitive wildlife species identified on site include Hermes copper butterfly, Cooper's hawk, turkey vulture, bobcat, San Diego coast horned lizard, and coastal western whiptail. Sensitive plant species identified onsite include San Diego sagewort. The project site is located in the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and a portion of the site is designated as Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA).

As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to sensitive habitat and/or species will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: preservation of 37.6 acres of on-site habitat, breeding season avoidance to prevent brushing, clearing, and/or grading between January 15 and July

15, temporary fencing, permanent open space fencing and signage, and biological monitoring during all land disturbing activities. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio 1.5, 1.6 and Bio 1.7.

- 4(b) Based on the Biological Resources report, the project site contains a USGS "blue-line" stream that qualifies as a wetland under federal, state and County regulations and includes southern coast live oak riparian forest and freshwater seep. This area will be located within the onsite open space and therefore the project will not result in wetland impacts. In addition, the following sensitive habitats were identified on the site: non-native grassland and southern mixed chaparral. As detailed in response a) above, direct and indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the RPO, NCCP, Fish and Wildlife Code, and Endangered Species Act are mitigated through implementation of offsite habitat purchases.

As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to sensitive habitats will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: preservation of 37.6 acres of on-site habitat, breeding season avoidance to prevent brushing, clearing, and/or grading between January 15 and July 15, temporary fencing, permanent open space fencing and signage, and biological monitoring during all land disturbing activities. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio 1.5, 1.6 and Bio 1.7.

- 4(c) Based on the Biological Resources report, the project site contains a USGS "blue-line" stream that qualifies as a wetland under Federal, State and County regulations and includes southern coast live oak riparian forest and freshwater seep. Wetlands are located entirely within the onsite open space easement and therefore, no impacts will occur.

- 4(d) The project site is located directly north of Skyline Truck Trail in the Community of Jamul-Dulzura. Based on a GIS analysis, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit by County staff, and a Biological Resources Report, it was determined that the site is part of the Otay Mountain/ Jamul Mountain to Sequan Peak linkage as identified on MSCP maps. The project includes a biological open space easement over the western portion of the project site which is generally consistent with the identified linkage. With the dedication of the onsite open space, the project would contribute to the preservation of the Otay Mountain/ Jamul Mountain to Sequan Peak linkage and provide for ongoing wildlife movement in the area.

As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to sensitive habitats will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: preservation of 37.6 acres of on-site habitat, breeding season avoidance to prevent brushing, clearing, and/or grading between January 15 and July 15, temporary fencing, permanent open space fencing and signage, and biological monitoring during all land disturbing activities. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio 1.5, 1.6 and Bio 1.7.

- 4(e) The project is consistent with the MSCP, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, and Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) because onsite preservation will be required to compensate for the loss of significant habitat.

As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to sensitive habitats will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation

measures: preservation of 37.6 acres of on-site habitat, breeding season avoidance to prevent brushing, clearing, and/or grading between January 15 and July 15, temporary fencing, permanent open space fencing and signage, and biological monitoring during all land disturbing activities. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio 1.5, 1.6 and Bio 1.7.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. Peculiar impacts to the project or its site not addressed by the GPU EIR have not been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project. The dedication of an onsite open space easement will ensure that high quality habitat is conserved in perpetuity.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 5(a) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County approved archaeologist Brian F. Smith on March 12, 2012, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled, "An Archaeological Assessment of the Skyline Truck Trail Lot Split Project", prepared by Brian F. Smith dated March 12, 2012. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources.

- 5(b) Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, as well as an Archeological Report prepared by Brian F. Smith, dated March 12, 2012, it has been determined that no archaeological resources that meet the significance criteria listed in CEQA or the County of San Diego guidelines were found on the property during archaeological surveys. In addition, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the project. No NAHC response was received. Mitigation measures will not be required; however, monitoring of grading will be a condition of approval due to the potential to encounter cultural material that was previously unidentified due to dense ground cover or because the resource was buried. A County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer will be a required condition of project approval. Additionally, before any ground disturbing activities can occur on site, the County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer will survey the parcel(s) to identify possible locations of cultural resources. If the initial determination is that these resources may qualify as significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5, then a testing and possible data recovery program may be required.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: grading monitoring under the supervision of a County-approved archaeologist and a Native American observer and conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul 2.5 and Cul 2.6.

- 5(c) The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.
- 5(d) A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.
- 5(e) Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, as well as an Archeological Report by Brian F. Smith, dated March 12, 2012, it has been determined that this property may contain undiscovered human remains. Seventeen archaeological sites have been recorded within a 1-mile radius, one which was recorded as a burial. The previous cultural reports do not provide adequate documentation to determine whether human remains exist on the property. In the absence of this data, combined with the presence of a burial grounds in the vicinity, it is assumed that the project may impact unknown human remains. To mitigate for these impacts, grading monitoring, consisting of a County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer, will be a required condition of project approval. Additionally, before any ground disturbing activities can occur on site, the County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer will survey the parcel(s) to identify possible locations of cultural resources and/or human remains. As outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, in the event that human remains are discovered during grading or construction of the project, the County will work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified

by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 to ensure that all human remains will be appropriately treated or disposed of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with native American burials with the appropriate native Americans as identified by the NAHC.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: grading monitoring under the supervision of a County-approved archaeologist and a Native American observer and conformance Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 if human remains are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul 2.5 and Cul 4.1.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. Peculiar impacts to the project or its site not addressed by the GPU EIR have not been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?

☐☐☐

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

☐☐☐

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☐☐☐

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

☐☐☐

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of

☐☐☐

septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Discussion

- 6(a)(i) The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault.
- 6(a)(ii) To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.
- 6(a)(iii) The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain.
- 6(a)(iv) The site is not located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards.
- 6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as CmrG, Cienega very rocky coarse sandy loam, and AvC, Arlington coarse sandy loam, both which have a soil erodibility rating of severe. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.
- 6(c) The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project.
- 6(d) The project is underlain by CmrG, Cienega very rocky coarse sandy loam, and AvC, Arlington coarse sandy loam, both which are considered to be an expansive soil as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, the project will not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.
- 6(e) The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves four individual septic systems located on the property. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site

Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria.” DEH approved the project’s OSWS on July 26, 2011. Therefore, the project has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as determined by the authorized, local public agency. In addition, the project will comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from geology/soils; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 7(a) The project would produce GHG emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion; however, the project would not generate more than the 900 metric ton threshold established by the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) white paper. Furthermore, projects that generate less than 900 metric tons of GHG will also participate in emission reductions because air emissions including GHGs are regulated either by the California Air Resources Control Board (CARB) the Federal Government, or other entities.
- 7(b) The County of San Diego is currently in the process of developing a Climate Action Plan which will provide direction for individual project to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets. CARB is in the process of developing regulations to implement the 33% standard known as the California Renewable Electricity Standard. Until local plans are adopted to address greenhouse gas emissions, the project is evaluated to determine whether it would impede the implementation of AB 32 GHG reduction targets. For the reasons discussed in the response to question 7(a) above, the project would not impede the implementation of AB 32 reduction targets and it would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

g) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion

8(a) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite which could produce a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials.

- 8(b) The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- 8(c) Based on a site visit and a comprehensive review of regulatory databases (see attached Hazards/Hazardous Materials references), the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.
- 8(d) The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.
- 8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip.
- 8(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.
- 8(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.
- 8(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located along the coastal zone.
- 8(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN: The project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.
- 8(f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.
- 8(g) The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code, as described in the approved Fire Protection Plan prepared for the project by Lamont Landis, (February 1, 2013). Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated October 31, 2007, has been received from the San Diego Rural Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be 6 minutes which is within the 20 minutes maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element.
- 8(h) The project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other

similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by County staff, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hazards/hazardous materials; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Violate any waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| n) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| o) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| p) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 9(a) The project will require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).
- 9(b) The project lies in the 909.21 (Jamacha) and 910.35 (Lyon) hydrologic subareas, within the San Diego hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed at the Pacific Ocean and mouth of the San Diego River is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the San Diego watershed include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals. The project could contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.

- 9(d) The project will obtain water from on-site groundwater wells and is groundwater dependent with no access to imported water. The subdivision will total 4 residential lots with a groundwater consumption of approximately 2.5 acre-feet per year. A site-specific Residential Well Test Report prepared by Peterson Environmental Services, Inc. dated September 22, 2009, on file with the Department of Planning and Development Services as Environmental Review Number 07-19-009, indicates that adequate groundwater resources are available to serve the project without interfering substantially with the production rate of nearby wells. As required by the County Groundwater Ordinance, acreage of each proposed lot is in compliance with the minimum parcel size requirement of 8 gross acres. In addition, a 34-year cumulative water balance of the project's tributary watershed was conducted by PDS dated June 18, 2009. The water balance results indicate that groundwater resources are adequate when taking past projects, current projects, and probable future projects into account. Therefore, the project and project's basin when developed with probable future projects will have sufficient water supplies available.
- 9(e) As outlined in the project's SWMP, the project will implement source control and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.
- 9(f) The project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons: based on a Drainage Study prepared by Ron Ashman of Crew Engineering and Surveying on November 2007, drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- 9(g) The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.
- 9(h) The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations.
- 9(j) No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or offsite improvement locations.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.
- 9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.
- 9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hydrology/water quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 10. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

10(a) The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area.

10(b) The project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to land use/planning; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 11. Mineral Resources – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

11(a) The project site has not been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology. However, the project site is surrounded by residential uses on large parcels which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

- 11(b) The project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands, nor is it located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s). No potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource or locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to mineral resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 12. Noise – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 12(a) The project consists of the subdivision of four residential lots. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc., and dated March 6, 2012, dedication of a Noise Restriction Easement on Parcel 4 will ensure that the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc., and dated March 6, 2012, project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). Based on the noise report, ground level noise sensitive areas are anticipated to experience future traffic noise levels ranging from 49 dBA CNEL to 59 dBA CNEL. Ground level noise levels will be as high as 39dBA CNEL at Parcel 1, 44dBA CNEL at Parcel 2, 50dBA CNEL at Parcel 3, and 54 dBA CNEL at Parcels 4. No mitigation is necessary to ground floor or second floor noise sensitive receptor. The project has been conditioned to provide a noise restriction easement on Parcel 4. Therefore, due to existing project site topography and dedication of a noise restriction easement will ensure the project will comply with County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404:

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc., and dated March 6, 2012, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A72 that has a one-hour average daytime sound limit of 50dBA and nighttime sound limit of 45dBA. The project's noise levels at the adjoining properties will not exceed County Noise Standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410:

The project will not generate construction noise in excess of Noise Ordinance standards. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

- 12(b) The project proposes residential uses which are sensitive to low ambient vibration. However, the residences would be setback more than 120 feet from any public road or transit Right-of-Way with projected noise contours of 60 dB or more; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. The project has been designed with a 120-foot Noise Easement setback along Skyline Truck Trail. A setback of 600 feet ensures that the operations do not have any chance of being impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment 1995).
- 12(c) As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise standards. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels.
- 12(d) The project does not involve any operational uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the Noise

Ordinance. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, the project will not operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24 hour period.

12(e) The project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

12(f) The project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from noise; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 13. Population and Housing – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

13(a) The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area.

13(b) The project will not displace existing housing.

13(c) The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to populations/housing; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|

14. Public Services – Would the Project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

☐☐☐**Discussion**

14(a) Based on the project's service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to public services; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|

15. Recreation – Would the Project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

☐☐☐

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☐☐☐**Discussion**

15(a) The project would incrementally increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities; however, the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance.

15(b) The project does not include trails and/or pathways.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to recreation; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 16. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 16(a) The project will result in an additional 48 ADT. However, the project will not conflict with any established performance measures because the project trips do not exceed the thresholds established by County guidelines. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.
- 16(b) The additional 48 ADTs from the project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG.
- 16(c) The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport.

- 16(d) The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.
- 16(e) The San Diego Rural Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and its Fire Protection Plan and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) The project will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to transportation/traffic; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

| | Significant Project Impact | Peculiar Impact not identified by GPU EIR | Substantial New Information |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 17. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project: | | | |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 17(a) The project proposes to discharge wastewater to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves four septic systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on July 26, 2011. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency.
- 17(b) The project does not involve new water or wastewater pipeline extensions.
- 17(c) The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(d) The project will obtain water from on-site groundwater wells. A site-specific Residential Well Test Report prepared by Peterson Environmental Services, Inc. dated September 22, 2009, on file with the Department of Planning and Development Services as Environmental Review Number 07-19-009, indicates that adequate groundwater resources are available to serve the project without interfering substantially with the production rate of nearby wells. As required by the County Groundwater Ordinance, acreage of each proposed lot is in compliance with the minimum parcel size requirement of 8 gross acres. In addition, a 34-year cumulative water balance of the project's tributary watershed was conducted by PDS dated June 18, 2009. The water balance results indicate that groundwater resources are adequate when taking past projects, current projects, and probable future projects into account. Therefore, the project and project's basin when developed with probable future projects will have sufficient water supplies available.
- 17(e) The project will rely on a private septic system for each parcel. Therefore, a Service Availability Letter from a sewer district is not required.
- 17(f) All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.
- 17(g) The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to utilities and service systems; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Attachments:

Appendix A – References

Appendix B – Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067

Appendix A

The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:

Acoustical Site Assessment Report (March 6, 2012) ISE, Inc.
Major SWMP (March 15, 2012) Crew Engineering and Surveying, Tom Koerner
Drainage Study (November 2007) Crew Engineering and Surveying, Ron Ashman
Well Testing Report (September 22, 2009) Peterson Environmental Services
Fire Protection Plan (March 18, 2012) Lamont Landis Consulting
Biological Resources Report (January 2013) Vincent N. Scheidt
Archaeological Assessment (May 1, 2008) Brian F. Smith

For a complete list of technical studies, references, and significance guidelines used to support the analysis of the General Plan Update Final Certified Program EIR, dated August 3, 2011, please visit the County's website at:

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00 -
References_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00_-_References_2011.pdf)

Appendix B

A Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067 is available on the Planning and Development Services website at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf